

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-19 and 22-25 were pending as of the Office Action mailed March 4, 2009. Claims 1, 22 and 24 are in independent form. Claims 1, 7-9, 16, 17, and 25 are being amended. Claims 2-6, 11-15, 18, and 22-24 are being cancelled. Claims 26-29 are being newly added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims and the new claims can be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 2, line 3 through page 4, line 1; page 8, line 18 through page 9, line 5; and FIGS. 2-4.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Amendment to the Drawings**

FIG. 4 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Specifically, within FIG. 4, reference number 226 has been amended to refer to an automation framework. Support for the amendment can be found within the Applicant's specification at least at page 8, lines 21-22. No new matter has been added. The applicant respectfully requests that the amendment to the drawings be entered.

### **Interview Summary**

The applicant thanks Examiner Wang for the courtesy of the in-person interview on August 26, 2009. The time spent with the applicant's representatives Tim Wilson, John Biernacki and Arrienne M. Lezak, was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the claims were discussed in view of the cited references. Recommendations were made by the examiner. These recommendations have been incorporated into the claims as noted above.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-7, 11-19, and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,947 ("DeLong") in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0015666 ("Kamani").

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DeLong and Kamani, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,449,744 (“Hansen”).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DeLong and Kamani, and further in view of Microsoft Office Visio 2003 Inside Out, Microsoft Press, October 29, 2003 (“Walker”).

#### Claim 1

To expedite prosecution, and in accordance with the examiner’s recommendations, claim 1 has been amended to require creating a file containing a list of required actions for testing an application, wherein the file is created on a test design automation independent tool within a first insulated environment, wherein the file is automatically transmitted to a test coding and execution automation independent tool in a second insulated environment that is separate from the first insulated environment; receiving the file in the second insulated environment and using the list to generate and execute the code to test the application and produce test results, wherein the code is generated and executed using the test coding and execution automation independent tool in the second insulated environment, and wherein the test results are automatically transmitted to a test analysis automation independent tool in a third insulated environment that is separate from the first and second insulated environments; and receiving the test results in the third insulated environment and comparing the received test results to one or more other received test results, wherein the comparison is done using the test analysis automation independent tool in the third insulated environment.

The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of DeLong and Kamani, alone or in combination, do not teach or describe each and every element of claim 1, as amended. Thus, the applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable.

#### Remaining Claims

Claims 7-9, 16, 17, and 25 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to that independent claim.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

#### New Claims 26-29

The support for new claims 26-29 is noted above. New claims 26 and 27 are method claims corresponding to system claim 1. New claims 26 and 27 recites features corresponding to those of claim 1 and therefore are allowable for the same reason set forth above with respect to claim 1.

New claim 28 requires that the generated code is translated into an application automation map using an application framework, wherein the application automation map is used to test the application. New claim 29 requires that a user can operate independently within each separate environment without having any knowledge of the other two environments.

The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings DeLong, Kamani, Hansen, and Walker, alone or in combination, do not teach or describe each and every element of new claims 26-29. Thus, the applicant submits that new claims 26-29 are allowable.

#### **Conclusion**

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-1432, Reference No. 343355-600076.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 4, 2009

By: /Arrienne M. Lezak/  
Arrienne M. Lezak  
Reg. No. 51,943  
JONES DAY  
1755 Embarcadero Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
(650) 687-4163